



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,250	10/06/2005	May Griffith	OHR5-001US	4662

959 7590 02/28/2011  
NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP  
FLOOR 30, SUITE 3000  
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
----------

ROGERS, JAMES WILLIAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1618

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/28/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/524,250	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GRIFFITH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JAMES W. ROGERS	<b>Art Unit</b> 1618	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 and 111-117 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-48, 50 and 111-117 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 49 and 118 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants amendments to the claims filed 01/24/2011 have been entered. Any objection\rejections from the previous office action filed 07/22/2010 not addressed below has been withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1618

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-12, 49 and 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elaissari et al. (US 7,060,804 B2), for the reasons set forth in the previous office action and the new reasoning below necessitated by applicants amendments.

Regarding the new limitations in claims 1 and 118, which recite that the intended use of the polymer is for implant (corneal implant in claim 118) it is the position of the examiner that the particles of Elaissari would be capable of implantation. The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Claims 1-12, 49 and 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Percot et al. (Polymer 41 (2000) 7231-7239) in view of Stile et al. (Macromolecules 1999, 32, 7370-7379, cited by applicants), for the reasons set forth in the previous office action and the new reasoning below necessitated by applicants amendments.

Regarding the new limitations in claims 1 and 118, which recite that the intended use of the copolymer is for implant (corneal implant in claim 118), as described in the

Art Unit: 1618

previous office action Stille describes hydrogels comprising NiPAAm were useful in injectable polymer scaffolds for tissue engineering applications and the reason provided to combine Percot and Stille would be to make a hydrogel suitable for injection. The examiner considers the injectable hydrogel taught by the combination above to be suitable as a corneal implant since it contains the same copolymer claimed. The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

Claims 1-12, 49 and 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uludag et al. (J. Appl. Polym. Sci., 75:583-592 (2000)) in view of Stile et al. (Macromolecules 1999, 32, 7370-7379), for the reasons set forth in the previous office action and the new reasoning below necessitated by applicants amendments.

Regarding the new limitations in claims 1 and 118, which recite that the intended use of the copolymer is for implant (corneal implant in claim 118), as described in the previous office action Stille describes hydrogels comprising NiPAAm were useful in injectable polymer scaffolds for tissue engineering applications and the reason provided to combine Uludag and Stille would be to make a hydrogel suitable for injection. The examiner considers the injectable hydrogel taught by the combination above to be

Art Unit: 1618

suitable as a corneal implant since it contains the same copolymer claimed. The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/01/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that US patent 4,614,701 does not teach synthetic implants therefore the examiner should rejoin all of the claims.

The examiner disagrees; the technical feature for applicants pending claims is a copolymer not an implant.

Applicants argue that the polymers of Elaissari would not be suitable for implantation in a patient.

The examiner disagrees, particles are capable of being implanted within a subject. The examiner notes that the claims are drawn to a copolymer and not an implant. Therefore the recitation that the polymer is used as an implant is no more than an intended use for the polymer. Elaissari teaches the same copolymer thus it would be capable of the same use.

Applicants argue in regards to Percot and Uludag, both in view of Stille, that their copolymer shows unexpected results when used as a corneal implant because the copolymer possesses a cloud point that is sufficiently low to ensure that a corneal implant prepared from the copolymer will not become opaque when used in the human body or on test animals.

Applicants must provide a declaration for evidence of unexpected results to be considered. Objective evidence which must be factually supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration to be of probative value includes evidence of unexpected results, commercial success, solution of a long-felt need, inoperability of the prior art, invention before the date of the reference, and allegations that the author(s) of the prior art derived the disclosed subject matter from the applicant. See, for example, *In re De Blauwe*, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (“It is well settled that unexpected results must be established by factual evidence.” “[A]ppellants have not presented any experimental data showing that prior heat-shrinkable articles split. Due to the absence of tests comparing appellant’s heat shrinkable articles with those of the closest prior art, we conclude that appellant’s assertions of unexpected results constitute mere argument.”). See also *In re Lindner*, 457 F.2d 506, 508, 173 USPQ 356, 358 (CCPA 1972); *Ex parte George*, 21 USPQ2d 1058 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1991). See also *In re Mayne*, 104 F.3d 1339, 1343-44, 41 USPQ2d 1451, 1455-56 (Fed. Cir. 1997). A showing of unexpected results must be based on evidence, not argument or speculation. Additionally, while a declaration has not been filed, the examiner notes that the claims are drawn to a polymer not an implant, thus even if applicants file a

declaration it is not seen how the declaration can be commensurate with the scope of pending claims.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed at this time.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James W. Rogers, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-7838. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Hartley can be reached on (571) 271-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent



Art Unit: 1618

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. W. R./

Examiner, Art Unit 1618

/Michael G. Hartley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618